



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dates of the "Nova Genera" of Humboldt, Bonpland and Kunth

BY JOHN HENDLEY BARNHART

Every student of systematic botany is familiar with the abbreviation "H.B.K.," and this at once brings to his mind the great seven-volume work, "Nova genera et species plantarum," commonly credited to Humboldt, Bonpland and Kunth; although the editorial work upon it was wholly Kunth's, and Baron von Humboldt's only contribution appears to have been the introductory essay. This work was the most extensive of several which constituted the botany of Humboldt and Bonpland's "Voyage," and different from the rest in the language employed, this being written in Latin, the others exclusively in French.

Having occasion recently to determine the date of publication of a certain portion of this work, and knowing that as it appeared in parts the title-page dates could not be depended upon, I undertook to ascertain the pagination and dates of all the original fascicles. The only recent reference to this subject which could be found was in a paper published in the Journal of Botany for June, 1901.* The authors of this paper appear to have been investigating the facts surrounding the publication of the zoölogical portion of Humboldt and Bonpland's "Voyage," and to have accumulated incidentally considerable information relating to the botanical volumes; and a debt of gratitude is certainly due them for placing their results within the reach of all.

Messrs. Sherborn and Woodward seem to have given us an accurate and fairly complete account of the "Plantes équinoxiales," "Melastomes," "Rhexies," "Mimoses" and "Graminées" of the Voyage reports, but as much cannot be said of their attempt to elucidate the "Nova genera." On one page they give a summary of the seven volumes, showing that these consist of 55, 51, 57, 39, 54, 68 and 66 sheets or signatures respectively; on the following pages they list the fascicles as announced from time to time in the "Bibliographie de la France," from which it would

* Sherborn, C. D., & Woodward, B. B. The Dates of Humboldt and Bonpland's "Voyage." Jour. Bot. 39 : 202-205. Je. 1901.

appear that the volumes contained about 89, 98, 91, 63, 86, 106 and 119 signatures respectively; after which they merely remark, "[The sheeting of the French records is a mystery to both of us]."

It is well known, or ought to be, that the "Nova genera" appeared simultaneously in two editions, one of folio size, the other in quarto. It is not so well known, except to those who have tried to verify references in the wrong edition, that the two differ widely in pagination; the only printed mention of this fact which I have seen is a brief note by Dr. Otto Kuntze,* and he does not seem to have had access to a copy of the fourth volume of the folio edition. The matter in the two editions is the same; they were issued in the same number of fascicles (36), and at the same time; and the plates were alike in the two editions, except for the width of the margin; but, the quarto page being much smaller, the text extended over a greater number of pages, so that each quarto fascicle consisted of many more pages than the corresponding folio fascicle, and the quarto volumes are thicker than the folio ones. Messrs. Sherborn and Woodward described the quarto volumes; nearly all of their quotations from the "French records" refer to the folio edition; it was for this reason that they were mystified. The "Bibliographie de la France," upon which they were obliged to rely almost wholly for the list they give, repeatedly mentions the quarto edition, and in many cases specifies the "sheeting" of the quarto parts; it is difficult to see how they could overlook this fact, although it may well have added to their perplexity.

The folio edition seems to have been prepared so that subscribers to the entire series of "Voyage" reports might have them of uniform size; the quarto edition, that botanists might secure this particular work at a reduced price. The latter, probably because of its cheapness and consequent greater accessibility to the average student, is the one almost invariably cited by botanists; it is the one always referred to by Kunth himself, in his later works. While convenient, this practice is not strictly logical; for, as the fascicles were issued without breaking signatures, those numbered correspondingly never contained precisely

* Kuntze, O. Rev. Gen. 3²: 156. 28 S. 1898.

the same text in the folio and in the quarto form. In many instances, in order to determine with exactness the date of publication of a new genus or species, it would be necessary to find out whether it first appeared in a folio or a quarto fascicle. A table showing the genera and species concerned, with the original place and date of publication, might prove useful in determining some question of priority; but such a list would be of very doubtful value until we are more certain than we can be at present of the exact pagination of every fascicle. It is very important, as mentioned by Sherborn and Woodward, that any one possessing the original fascicles, or any of them, should submit them to some bibliographer who would publish a careful description of them; but it must not be forgotten that *contemporary evidence is the best*, for a fascicle may appear to be in its original form, when actually altered in important particulars.

Before proceeding to a consideration of the probable contents of each part, it may be well to take a general survey of the pagination, signatures, etc., of the completed volumes. In this connection it must be remembered that the quadruple title-page in each volume took an entire quarto signature or two folio ones, while these were counted in numbering neither the signatures nor the pages. In some cases the French journal seems to have counted the title-pages in giving the number of signatures in a part, in other cases, not; and the uncertainty in this respect, together with the fact that the title-pages were probably published with the first part of most of the volumes, but with the last part of one or two, causes most of the trouble in definitely assigning certain pages to each fascicle. It must also be borne in mind that a single sheet forms four folio pages, but eight of quarto size, so that while the quarto volumes and fascicles have more pages than the folio, they have fewer signatures. The plates and title-page dates are the same in both editions; it is only in the text that they differ.

VOL.	FOLIO TEXT.	QUARTO TEXT.	PLATES.	T. P. DATE.
I.	(8), xlvi, (2), 302 pp. (2), 87½ (= a-i, k-m, 1-76) sign.	(8), lviii, (2), 377 pp. (1), 54¾ (= a-h, 1-48) sign.	1-96.	1815
II.	(8), 324 pp. (2), 81 sign.	(8), 404 (2) pp. (1), 50¾ (= 1-51) sign.	97-192.	1817

III.	(8), 356 pp. (2), 89 sign.	(8), 456 pp. (1), 57 sign.	193-300.	1818
IV.	(8), 247 pp. (2), 62 sign.	(8), 312 pp. (1), 39 sign.	301-412.	1820
V.	(8), 338 (2), pp. (2), 85 sign.	(8), 432 pp. (1), 54 sign.	413-512.	1821
VI.	(8), 420 (2) pp. (2), 105½ (= 1-106) sign.	(8), 542 pp. (1), 67¾ (= 1-68) sign.	513-600.	1823
VII.	(8), 399 pp. (2), 100 sign.	(8), 506 pp. (1), 65¼ (= 1-66) sign.	601-700.	1825

VOLUME I

This volume, in the folio form, presents little difficulty. It is true that fasc. 1 and 2 are noticed together in the B. F.* for 3 F. 1816, while it is quite likely that they were separately published, one or both of them before the end of the year 1815 (the title-page date). As we have absolutely no data indicating the pages at which they were separated, however; and as I have no strong evidence even in support of the supposition that they appeared separately, fasc. 1-2 will be treated here as a "double number." The fascicles forming Volume I folio were noticed as follows:

Fasc. 1-2.	44 sign, 44 <i>pl.</i>	B. F. 3 F.	1816.
" 3.	20 " 25 <i>pl.</i>	B. F. 11 My.	" †
" 4.	25½ " 27 <i>pl.</i>	B. F. 31 Au.	"

In all, 89½ signatures and 96 plates, precisely as the folio volume is described above, and we need have no hesitation in assigning data as follows:

Fasc. 1-2.	T.-p., pp. i-xlvi, 1-120, <i>pl.</i> 1-44.	Ja. 1816 (or D. 1815?)
" 3.	Pp. 121-200, <i>pl.</i> 45-69.	My. "
" 4.	Pp. 201-302, <i>pl.</i> 70-96.	Au. "

The B. F. gives no descriptions of fasc. 1-4 in the quarto form, and the following division is simply a provisional one, based upon the supposition that the corresponding quarto and folio parts contained approximately the same matter: a supposition which is warranted by the known facts in the case of many of the later fascicles.

Fasc. 1-2.	T.-p., pp. i-lx, 1-152, <i>pl.</i> 1-44.	Ja. 1816 (or D. 1815?)
" 3.	Pp. 153-256, <i>pl.</i> 45-69.	My. "
" 4.	Pp. 257-377, <i>pl.</i> 70-96.	Au. "

* In the following discussion the references to the "Bibliographie de la France" will be so frequent that its title will be abbreviated to "B. F."

† Not 2 My. as given by Sherborn and Woodward.

VOLUME II

This volume consisted of fasc. 5-8. Unfortunately fasc. 5 is badly mixed in the B. F. It is noticed 3 My. 1817, but is called the *fourth* fascicle (an error corrected 13 D. 1817, in noting the next fascicle*), and although the description, "13 feuilles et demie, plus 25 planches," is accompanied by the statement "in-folio," it is evident from the price named that it was the quarto edition which the bibliographer had in hand. There is little doubt, however, that fasc. 5 contained, in the folio form, pp. 1-80, and in the quarto, pp. 1-96, and the B. F. is no doubt correct in saying 25 plates, viz., *pl.* 97-121.

Fasc. 6, 7 and 8 are given by the B. F. as follows :

Fasc. 6.	Folio, 18 sign.	Quarto, 12 sign.	25 <i>pl.</i>	13 D. 1817.
" 7.	" 17 sign.	" 11 sign.	22 <i>pl.</i>	28 F. 1818.
" 8.	" 50 sign.	" 25 sign.	34 <i>pl.</i>	6 Je. 1818.

The record in the case of fasc. 8 is certainly very puzzling. Sherborn and Woodward suggest that the "34" plates may be a typographical error for "24," but there is no need to suppose such an error, for there is little doubt that ten plates (193-202) belonging to the following volume appeared with this fascicle. It is the record of the text which is surprising. These three fascicles alone (6, 7 and 8), according to the B. F., contained 85 signatures, folio, while the entire volume had only 83, *title-pages included!* We are left only two explanations: either the B. F. is in error, the folio fasc. 8 consisting of about 26 signatures, the quarto of about 16; or, as is liable to occur in any such work as this, fasc. 8 may have contained a second printing of some of the previously published text, which in its original form was not satisfactory to the authors.

The probable pagination and dates of fasc. 5-8 are as follows :

FOLIO

Fasc. 5.	T.-p. pp. 1-80 (with reprint of vol. I, pp. 301-302?), <i>pl.</i> 97-121.	Ap. 1817
" 6.	Pp. 81-152, <i>pl.</i> 122-146.	D. "
" 7.	Pp. 153-220, <i>pl.</i> 147-168.	F. 1818
" 8.	Pp. 221-324 (+?), <i>pl.</i> 169-202.	Je. "

* "Cette sixième livraison est la deuxième du second volume; c'est la cinquième (et non la quatrième), qui a paru en mai dernier."

QUARTO

Fasc. 5.	T.-p., pp. 1-96, <i>pl.</i> 97-121.	Ap. 1817
" 6.	Pp. 97-192, <i>pl.</i> 122-146.	D. "
" 7.	Pp. 193-280, <i>pl.</i> 147-168.	F. 1818
" 8.	Pp. 281-406 (+?), <i>pl.</i> 169-202.	Je. "

VOLUME III

The third volume consisted of five fascicles, nos. 9-13; although plates 193-202 had appeared with fasc. 8. The B. F. gives the data for these fascicles, in folio, as follows:

Fasc. 9.	20 signatures, 25 <i>plates</i> .	3 O.	1818.
" 10.	19 " 15 "	13 F.	1819.
" 11.	19 " 25 "	17 Jl.	"
" 12.	18 " 25 "	27 N.	"
" 13.	15 " 9 "	11 Mr.	1820.

The number of signatures agrees exactly with the description of the volume given above, so that we have no hesitation in deciding upon the pagination. We have here mention of only 99 plates, however, while the volume contained 108, one of which was issued twice, as will be mentioned further on; and this, with the distinct statement of the B. F. that fasc. 13 completed the third volume, is additional evidence that the B. F. was correct in assigning 34 plates to fasc. 8. If more evidence is desired, it is not lacking. The "Allgemeine Repertorium" of Leipzig, in its first mention of this work,* reviews the folio edition as far as Vol. III, page 148, *plate* 242; evidently to the end of fasc. 10 ("1818," by the way). Now if fasc. 10 ended with plate 242, and contained 15 plates, it must have begun with plate 228; if fasc. 9 ended with plate 227, and contained 25 plates, it must have begun with plate 203; but the volume began with plate 193; therefore, plates 193-202 must have appeared with fasc. 8, and the B. F. must be correct in assigning 34 plates to that fascicle — or, if it contained only 24, there must have been 25 plates in fasc. 10, instead of 15 as stated. At least, the B. F. is consistent with itself in this matter, and I prefer to accept its statements until they are proven incorrect.

Plate no. 216 was published in fasc. 9, the name upon it reading "*Aragoa juniperina*." When this species was reached in the text, however, in fasc. 10 (page 121 of the folio, page 156 of the

* Allg. Repert. 1819³: 132-136.

quarto), it was called "*Aragoa cupressina*"; and later (not with fasc. 10, but probably with fasc. 13), a new plate numbered "216" appeared. The new plate bore the corrected name, and upon it the original detail figures were replaced by entirely new ones.

Fasc. 9 contained the descriptions of certain new species of *Nicotiana* and *Heliotropium*, which had been published by Lehmann, under the same or in some cases under different names, only a short time before. This greatly annoyed Kunth, who thought that Lehmann should have awaited the appearance of this portion of the "Nova genera" before issuing his work. A letter written by Kunth in this connection, with Lehmann's reply, may be found in the first volume of *Flora*.*

In noting fasc. 9-13, the B. F. mentions the quarto edition several times, but gives the number of signatures only in the case of fasc. 10, when there were twelve. There is little doubt of the pagination, however, and we may, sum up this volume thus :

FOLIO TEXT.	QUARTO TEXT.	PLATES.	DATE.
Fasc. 9. T.-p., pp. 1-72.	T.-p., pp. 1-96.	203-227.	S. 1818.
" 10. Pp. 73-148.	Pp. 97-192.	228-242.	F. 1819.
" 11. Pp. 149-224.	Pp. 193-288.	243-267.	Jl. "
" 12. Pp. 225-296.	Pp. 289-384.	268-292.	N. "
" 13. Pp. 297-356.	Pp. 385-456.	293-300, 216 bis.	Mr. 1820.

VOLUME IV

Volume IV comprised fasc. 14-18, the last of which was not given to the public until late in the year 1820; although, as we shall see, the entire text was in print, and to a limited extent accessible, two years earlier. According to Sherborn and Woodward, fasc. 14 contained Vol. III, pp. 417-456, and Vol. IV, pp. 1-72. It is apparent that they were led to this conclusion by some evidence that this fascicle ended with page 72 (which is true of the quarto); but as 72 pp. in their quarto edition made only 9 signatures, and the B. F. stated that fasc. 14 consisted of 14 signatures, they decided that this fascicle must have contained the last five signatures (which would be pp. 417-456 of the quarto) of Vol. III—in other words, their confusion of the two editions in this case led them into grave error. The B. F. distinctly states that fasc. 13 completed the third volume, and there can be no doubt that this was the case.

* *Flora*, I: 601-607. 20 D. 1818.

Sherborn and Woodward, in describing fascicle 15, say of the plates: "25 pls. 326-340." This is plainly either a clerical or a typographical error; the 25 plates were nos. 326-349, two plates bearing the number "332."

The B. F. gives us quite complete data for this volume:

Fasc. 14.	Folio, 14 sign.	Quarto, 9 sign.	25 plates.	15 Ap. 1820.
" 15.	" 16 sign.	" 10 sign.	25 "	27 My. "
" 16.	" 12 sign.	" 9 sign.	24 "	22 Jl. "
" 17.	" 12 sign.	" 8 sign.	24 "	16 S. "
" 18.	" 9 sign.	" 4 sign.	13 "	24 D. "

The "13" plates credited to fasc. 18 probably should be 15; and in counting the folio signatures the title-pages, which in this case seem to have come out with the last fascicle of the volume instead of the first, must have been reckoned as one instead of two. This gives the following summary.

	FOLIO TEXT.	QUARTO TEXT.	PLATES.	DATE.
Fasc. 14.	Pp. 1-56.	Pp. 1-72.	301-325.	Ap. 1820.
" 15.	Pp. 57-120.	Pp. 73-152.	326-332 bis, 332-349.	My. "
" 16.	Pp. 121-168.	Pp. 153-224.	350-373.	Jl. "
" 17.	Pp. 169-216.	Pp. 225-288.	374-397.	S. "
" 18.	Pp. 217-247, t.-p.	Pp. 289-312, t.-p.	398-412.	D. "

It will be noted that these five fascicles followed one another with unprecedented rapidity; and "thereby hangs a tale." On the 26th of October, 1818, in order to fix the date of publication of this volume, Kunth presented a complete copy of the text to the Academy of Sciences of Paris. It consisted of loose sheets of the folio edition, and had a manuscript title-page, on which was set forth the fact that the printing was begun in September, 1817, and completed in September, 1818. At this time the publication of Volume III had only just begun, and Kunth had no idea of offering Volume IV to the public until it was reached in its turn after the completion of Volume III; in fact, the plates of Volume IV had not been engraved. Yet Kunth hurried the text through the press, and took this method of securing its advance publication.

Henri Cassini, one of the members of the Academy, had devoted his leisure "for the past eight or nine years," as he tells us, to the study of the Compositae, and was at that time recognized as the foremost living authority upon that group of plants. Volume IV of the "Nova genera" comprised the Compositae,

and the *Compositae* only ; was it any wonder, then, that Cassini regarded the "extraordinary precipitancy" of Kunth, in presenting this copy to the Academy, as a decidedly personal affair ? Cassini criticised Kunth for issuing the work in this way, in loose sheets, with a manuscript title, and without plates ; in the folio form, too, "qui n'est probablement consacré qu'à un petit nombre d'exemplaires," while the quarto is the one more generally distributed and usually quoted. But especially did he protest against the recognition of this method of publication, as it contained no guarantee that the work as finally issued to the public would be identical with the copy presented to the Academy.

Kunth insisted that Volume IV was printed simply because the funds were available and the manuscript had been completed for several years ; he pledged his honor that the work as finally issued to the public would be identical with the copy presented to the Academy, except for the alteration of one short and unimportant paragraph to which Cassini had objected ; and he further mollified the latter by presenting him with a copy of the volume in dispute, on the first of December, 1818. On his part Cassini agreed to accept the latter date as the actual date of publication. A delicate question is here involved. We cannot insist that this volume was not published in 1818 because it was not offered for sale at that time, for some works whose due publication is never questioned (Linnaeus' "*Hortus Cliffortianus*" is a famous example) were never offered for sale until at length second-hand copies came into the market. It is universally agreed that as long as all copies of a printed work remain in the hands of the author, its status is the same as that of a manuscript, even if he permits it to be inspected by others. But does the distribution of one or two copies constitute publication ? The question here is almost identical with that involving the date of publication of Fournier's "*Mexicanas Plantas, Pars II. Gramineae*." This bears the date 1886 upon the title-page, and was not accessible to the general public until that year ; but Bentham had a copy of the text as early as 1881, and repeatedly cited it ; nor is it certain that other complimentary copies were not issued in advance.

We come now to consider the single change in Volume IV after it was first printed. A note, near the bottom of page 243,

in the "addenda et corrigenda," read originally as follows : "Pars hujus operis, quae de Compositarum familia tractat ; jam ante tres fere annos a me finita, illo tempore, a clarissimo Henrico Cassini, leviter quidem, ob magnam specierum et generum copiam inspecta est. Quo factum est, ut nomina et characteres generum nostrorum novorum non retinens, Ampherephis speciei tertiae, in herbario illustr. Jussieu asservatae, tanquam distincto generi, nomen Centhratheri imponeret." Immediately and indignantly did Cassini resent this implied reflection upon his honor, and brand it as a falsehood ; and although Kunth maintained that no offense had been intended by the original statement, the objectional paragraph was modified until, as finally presented to the subscribers to the "Nova genera," it took this harmless form : "Pars hujus operis quae de Compositarum familia agit, jam exeunte anno 1815 a me ad finem perducta, nonnisi mense septembre 1817 typis describi coepta est, absoluta eodem mense 1818, vulgata 1820. Interea celeberrimus Cassinius, observationum mearum inscius, Compositas summa diligentia raraque sagacitate scrutari continuavit sectionesque et genera proponere : quo factum est, ut eorum complura diversis nominibus a Cassinio et me nuncupata exstent ; quod semper usu veniet, quotiescunque duo in plantas examinandas aequae exercitati botanici eandem familiam investigant generaue in ea instituere necesse judicant et instituunt. Ampherephis species duas in herbario Humboldtiano observavi, tertiam in herbario Jussiaeano, cui nomen a me inventum tunc stylo cerussato adscribere haud neglexi, Celeberrimus Cassinius vero non animadvertens, opinor, id nomen ibi jam a me appositum esse, plantae Jussiaeanae nomen Centratheri imposuit."

Those wishing to learn further particulars of this controversy should consult the papers by Cassini and Kunth, published in volume 89 of the "Journal de physique, de chimie et d'histoire naturelle ;" * and those who do not acknowledge that the volume was published until issued in parts in 1820, should not overlook

* Cassini, H. Analyse critique et raisonnée du quatrième volume de l'ouvrage de M. Kunth, intitulé, *Nova genera et species plantarum*. Jour. phys. 89 : 5-33. Jl. 1819.

Kunth, C. S. A une article de M. Cassini, ayant pour titre : *Analyse critique et raisonnée du quatrième volume du Nova genera et species plantarum aequinoctialium*. Jour. phys. 89 : 278-284. O. 1819.

the fact that the new genera were all listed and criticised by Cassini in this "Journal de physique" during the preceding year.

VOLUME V

This volume consisted of fasc. 19-23, and the B. F. furnishes quite a complete account of them, except in the case of quarto fasc. 21, which probably was composed of 12 signatures.

Fasc. 19.	Folio, 16	sign.	Quarto, 9	sign.	24 plates.	26 My. 1821.
" 20.	" 14	"	" 8	"	24 "	29 S. "
" 21.	" 16	"	" -	"	20 "	23 F. 1822.
" 22.	" 15	"	" 10	"	20 "	29 Je. "
" 23.	" 25½	"	" 15⅓	"	15 "	22 Mr. 1823.

The pagination and plates were probably as follows :

FASC.	FOLIO TEXT.	QUARTO TEXT.	PLATES.
19.	T.-p., pp. 1-56.	T.-p., pp. 1-64.	413-436.
20.	Pp. 57-112.	Pp. 65-128.	437-460.
21.	Pp. 113-176.	Pp. 129-224.	461-480.
22.	Pp. 177-236.	Pp. 225-304.	481a-b, 482, 483, 483a, 484-498.
23.	Pp. 237-338.	Pp. 305-332.	499a-b, 500-512.

The two unnumbered pages of the folio edition following page 338, and the corresponding pages of the quarto edition, *may* have appeared at a later date.

VOLUME VI

Six fascicles constituted this volume, viz. nos. 24-29. Of these the B. F. gives data for quarto fasc. 24-26, and all the folio fascicles. There is evidently some error in the number of plates assigned to fasc. 24, unless many of the earlier plates were re-issued at this time. This makes the numbers of the plates in each fascicle of this volume quite doubtful :

Fasc. 24.	Folio, 28 sign.	Quarto, 10 sign.	37 plates.	19 Ap. 1823.
" 25.	" 17 sign.	" 12 sign.	15 "	30 Au. "
" 26.	" 15 sign.	" 9 sign.	15 "	24 Ja. 1824.
" 27.	" 16 sign.		17 "	24 Ap. "
" 28.	" 15 sign.		16 "	21 Au. "
" 29.	" 15 sign.		15 "	4 S. "

In noting the folio, the title-page seems to have been counted as one signature ; and the two unnumbered pages forming signature 106, at the end of the volume, do not seem to have been included, and may have appeared with a later fascicle. From the description in Férussac's Bulletin (cited by Sherborn and Wood-

ward) we can fix the pagination of quarto fasc. 28, and indirectly that of the preceding and following fascicles. The following is a record of this volume as I understand it :

Fasc. 24.	Folio, T.-p., Pp. 1-108.	Quarto, T.-p., Pp. 1-72.	<i>Pl. 513-522 ?</i>
" 25.	" Pp. 109-176.	" Pp. 73-168.	<i>Pl. 523-537 ?</i>
" 26.	" Pp. 177-236.	" Pp. 169-240.	<i>Pl. 538-552 ?</i>
" 27.	" Pp. 237-300.	" Pp. 241-320.	<i>Pl. 553-569 ?</i>
" 28.	" Pp. 301-360.	" Pp. 321-392.	<i>Pl. 570-585 ?</i>
" 29.	" Pp. 361-420 (2 ?).	" Pp. 393-542.	<i>Pl. 586-600 ?</i>

In this volume, for the first time, the proportionate size of the corresponding folio and quarto parts is widely at variance.

VOLUME VII

The final volume was published in fasc. 30-36. As the B. F. says that fasc. 30 (folio) was composed of 13 signatures, while it quite certainly contained only pp. 1-48, the other signature very likely consisted of the "addenda et corrigenda" of Volumes V and VI. It may have represented the title-pages of Volume VII, but as these are dated 1825, they were probably issued with the last part (fasc. 36). Fasc. 36, too, is said to have been composed of 29 signatures ; if so, some 18 of these must have been re-issues of earlier portions of the work. The B. F. mentions the quarto edition several times, but fails to give its sheeting. Its record of the folio is this :

Fasc. 30.	13 signatures.	15 plates.	13 N.	1824.
" 31.	16 "	15 "	25 D.	"
" 32.	16 "	15 "	19 F.	1825.
" 33.	15 "	15 "	14 My.	"
" 34.	15 "	15 "	18 Je.	"
" 35.	15 "	18 "	30 Jl.	"
" 36.	29 "	10 "	3 D.	"

The probable pagination is given herewith, but it must be confessed that in the case of the quarto this is largely guess work.

FASC.	FOLIO TEXT.	QUARTO TEXT.	PLATES.	
30.	Pp. 1-48.	Pp. 1-56.	601-615.	N. 1824.
31.	Pp. 49-112.	Pp. 57-144.	616-630.	D. "
32.	Pp. 113-176.	Pp. 145-224.	631-645.	F. 1825.
33.	Pp. 177-236.	Pp. 225-296.	646-659 659 bis.	My. "
34.	Pp. 237-296.	Pp. 297-376.	660-661 bis, 662-673.	Je. "
35.	Pp. 297-356.	Pp. 377-448.	674-688 bis, 689-690.	Jl. "
36.	Pp. 357-399 (+ ?).	Pp. 449-506 (+ ?).	691-700.	N. "

RÉSUMÉ

The following résumé is intended merely as an aid to those who may wish to determine quickly the probable date of publication of a given page or plate. Consequently all details of title-pages, repeated plates, etc., are omitted. Data which seem to me certain beyond a reasonable doubt are indicated by an exclamation point (!), while a mark of interrogation (?) accompanies those which are simply guesses. The unmarked data are chiefly strong probabilities.

FASC.	VOL.	FOLIO TEXT, PP.	QUARTO TEXT, PP.	PLATES.	DATE.	
1-2	I.	i-xlvi, 1-120.	i-lx, 1-152?	1-44!	Ja. 1816.	[B. F. 3 F.]
3		121-200.	153-256?	45-69!	My. "	[B. F. 11 My.]
4		201-302.	257-377?	70-96!	Au. "	[B. F. 31 Au.]
5	II.	1-80!	1-96.	97-121!	Ap. 1817.	[B. F. 3 My.]
6		81-152.	97-192!	122-146!	D. "	[B. F. 13 D.]
7		153-220.	193-280.	147-168!	F. 1818.	[B. F. 28 F.]
8		221-324.	281-406.	169-202!	Je. "	[B. F. 6 Je.]
9	III.	1-72.	1-96!	203-227!	S. "	[B. F. 3 O.]
10		73-148!	97-192.	228-242	F. 1819.	[B. F. 13 F.]
11		149-224.	193-288.	243-267?	Jl. "	[B. F. 17 Jl.]
12		225-296.	289-384.	268-292?	N. "	[B. F. 27 N.]
13		297-356.	385-456.	293-300?	Mr. 1820.	[B. F. 11 Mr.]
14	IV.	1-56.	1-72.	301-325!	Ap. "	[B. F. 15 Ap.]
15		57-120.	73-152.	326-349!	My. "	[B. F. 27 My.]
16		121-168.	153-224?	350-373!	Jl. "	[B. F. 22 Jl.]
17		169-216.	225-288?	374-397!	S. "	[B. F. 16 S.]
18		217-247.	289-312.	398-412!	D. "	[B. F. 24 D.]
(Entire folio text of Volume IV, accessible at Paris from 26 O. 1818.)						
19	V.	1-56.	1-64.	413-436.	My. 1821.	[B. F. 26 My.]
20		57-112.	65-128.	437-460.	S. "	[B. F. 29 S.]
21		113-176.	129-224.	461-480.	F. 1822.	[B. F. 23 F.]
22		177-236.	225-304.	481a-498.	Je. "	[B. F. 29 Je.]
23		237-338.	305-332.	499a-512.	Mr. 1823.	[B. F. 22 Mr.]
24	VI.	1-108.	1-72.	513-522?	Ap. "	[B. F. 19 Ap.]
25		109-176.	73-168.	523-537?	Au. "	[B. F. 30 Au.]
26		177-236.	169-240.	538-552?	Jan. 1824.	[B. F. 24 Ja.]
27		237-300.	241-320.	553-569?	Ap. "	[B. F. 24 Ap.]
28		301-360.	321-392!	570-585?	Au. "	[B. F. 21 Au.]
29		361-420.	393-542.	586-600?	S. "	[B. F. 4 S.]
30	VII.	1-48!	1-56.	601-615!	N. "	[B. F. 13 N.]
31		49-112.	57-144.	616-630!	D. "	[B. F. 25 D.]
32		113-176.	145-224.	631-645!	F. 1825.	[B. F. 19 F.]
33		177-236.	225-296.	646-659 bis!	My. "	[B. F. 14 My.]
34		237-296.	297-376.	660-673!	Je. "	[B. F. 18 Je.]
35		397-356.	377-448.	674-690!	Jl. "	[B. F. 30 Jl.]
36		357-399.	449-506.	691-700!	N. "	[B. F. 3 D.]

There is little doubt that the first two fascicles were dated "1815," and that fascicle 10 was dated "1818"; and it is not certain that these fascicles were not actually issued before the close of those years. In fact, all of the dates under which notices appeared in the "Bibliographie de la France" may be as much as six or eight weeks later than the actual publication of the fascicles.

TARRYTOWN. N. Y.